Haskell, 97 Pac. 590. The statute was attacked by the plaintiff bank on the ground that it impaired its contract rights under its charter, and that it resulted in taking property without due process of law. As the constitution of Oklahoma reserved the right to the State to after, amend or revoke all charters, there was plainly no basis for the plaintiff's first contention, and as the act applied only to banks incorporated under the laws of the State, the same constitutional provision disposed of the second contention,—in other words, the levy of an assessment equal to 1 per cent of the average deposits of a bank for the purpose of making a fund from which depositors in insolvent banks could be repaid their deposits, amounted to nothing more than amending the charters of all banks incorporated by the State. The Supreme Court of Oklahoma accordingly held the act in question not in conflict with either the State or Federal constitution. The opinion of the court, delivered by Williams, C. J., contains an extensive review of the authorities with reference to the powers belonging to the States to control corporations organized under their laws.—National Corporation Reporter.

Right to Waters Underlying Land.—A somewhat novel question was presented in Hathorn *v.* National Carbonic Gas Company, 112 N. Y. Supp. 374. A statute of New York prohibited pumping or otherwise drawing by artificial appliances from any well made by drilling into the rock, certain mineral waters, etc., for the purpose of extracting and vending the gas separate from the water. The statute seems to have been made to order for the benefit of certain persons owning mineral springs at Saratoga, and drawing their water from the same general subterranean reservoir. The contention of the defendant was that it had the right to draw in any way it saw fit all of the water that came into its well, even though that proceeding resulted in drawing all of the water from the common reservoir. It is difficult to concur in the opinion of the New York Court, upholding the statute. Certainly, at common law, if the wells of A and B tapped the same sources of supply, neither could restrain the other from drawing from his well to any extent that he saw fit, and if the supply was not sufficient for both of them, the one who was most diligent in appropriating it would acquire a good title to it. The same principle has been followed, we believe, in all of the States with reference to oil and gas, no effort having been made so far as we know to restrain the appropriation by the owner of one well of all the oil or gas that he could get by pumping, dynamiting, etc.—National Corporation Reporter.

Disbarred Attorney Disqualified from Acting as State's Attorney.—In an interesting opinion handed down by the Supreme Court of South Dakota in Danforth *v.* Egan, 119 Northwestern Reporter, 1021,